DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 611 HE 000 935

By-Shipman, M.D.

Participation and Staff-Student Relations. A Seven Year Study of Social Changes in an Expanding College of Education.

Society for Research into Higher Education, Ltd., London (England).
Pub Date Mar 69
Note-43p.
Journal Cit-Research into Higher Education Monographs; n6 Mar 69
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.25
Descriptors-Facility Expansion, Higher Education, *Organizational Change, Organizational Climate, *School Expansion, *Social Relations, Student College Relationship, *Student Teacher Relationship, *Teachers Colleges
Identifiers-*Colleges of Education, England

Although sustained social relations between staff and students are built into the organization of English colleges of education, expansion tends to reduce social interaction and devalue the communal life of the colleges. A high level of social activity, universal participation and plentiful and close staff-student relations were evident at Worcester College of Education in 1961--a social structure produced by the interaction of a number of interrelated factors in the early history of the college. With physical expansion and accompanying changes in academic and professional work, these traditions came under strain although the values of the early period survived as references. The persistence of old expectations in a new situation helped in the search for remedies, yet worked to conserve customary (and inappropriate) ways of organizing social life. Students resisted reform until 1967 when a small minority was able to dominate student affairs because of lack of participation by the majority. By 1967, there was an apparent anomaly of changes in the roles which student and staff felt obliged to play in an expanding college, not accompanied by any change in the perception of the staff's role by students, or the students' role by staff. The increased size of the institution resulted in more formal and limited social relations between staff and students not merely because of few facilities conducive to intimacy but because the motivation to participate had gone. The research investigating this total pattern of interaction was conducted from 1961 to 1968. (JS)

research
into
higher
education
MONOGRAPHS

PARTICIPATION AND STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONS

A Seven Year Study of Social Changes in an Expanding College of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

M. D. Shipman

The SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION is a registered charity and was set up in December 1964 to encourage and co-ordinate research into all aspects of higher education. It seeks to make research findings more widely available and to promote their more effective use.

The Society

organises conferences, study groups, seminars and other meetings at national and regional level;

holds an Annual Conference at which recent research findings are presented and discussed;

maintains a Register of research in progress;

issues a quarterly series of Abstracts of the more important literature;

reports on matters of interest and publicises its activities in a monthly Bulletin;

publishes reports and review monographs;

collects unpublished research material, thus enabling it to be made more widely available;

works in collaboration with other national bodies interested in research into higher education and seeks to establish contact with overseas organisations.

Membership of the Society is open to institutions (corporate subscription: 15 guineas per annum) and to individuals (subscription: 3 guineas per annum).

Enquiries are welcome and should be addressed to The Secretary, Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd., 2 Woburn Square, London, WC1.

Price 9/-

PARTICIPATION AND STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONS

A Seven Year Study of Social Changes in an Expanding College of Education

by

M. D. Shipman

Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd.,
2 Woburn Square, London WC1.

March 1969

Before he turned to an academic career DR. M. D. SHIPMAN worked both in industry and in the police force. In 1956 he took a first degree in Sociology at the London School of Economics. After a professional training for teaching he spent four years teaching in secondary modern schools. From 1961 to 1968 he was Lecturer in Education and Sociology at the Worcester College of Education. He is now Lecturer in Education at the University of Keele.
Dr. Shipman has written articles on the education of teachers, the changing role of the lecturer in colleges of education, the methodological problems of investigating attitudes in small communities, and a book on the sociology of the school. He is currently working on the interaction between the organisation of schools and curriculum developments.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of higher education in Britain has converted many small colleges and universities into large, bureaucratic organisations. This applies particularly to the colleges of education whose expansion, both in the first half of this century and since 1950 has been faster than that of the universities. In 1958, under 16,000 students entered the colleges. In 1968 this intake had risen to just under 40,000. This expansion was achieved by the growth of existing colleges rather than through new foundations. In 1958 only 3 colleges had over 500 students. In 1968 100 colleges had over 500, and 14 colleges had over 1,000 students.

While not even the largest British university has the problems of size which face such American universities as California at Berkeley, most have had to adjust, not only to increased numbers, but to the accompanying decrease in the proportion of students in residence. Furthermore, unlike continental universities the British tradition has been of a community of scholars sharing a common experience in which academic and social interaction were inseparable. Thus expansion has caused more anxiety here through its effect on community life.

Social interaction among students, and between them and tutorial staff, is important in establishing good social relations, in supporting formal tuition, and in reducing communal tension and individual stress. In colleges of education participation in organised social activity and close staff-student relations are also important in professional preparation. Although there is a debate in the universities over the pastoral role of tutors, sustained social relations are built into the organisation of English colleges of education.

DEVELOPMENTS AT WORCESTER COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Worcester College of Education opened in 1946 as an Emergency Training College to give a one-year course to ex-service men and women. It was situated on the edge of the town, a bus ride away from the main shopping and entertainment centre. The campus was large and contained a farm, an orchard and the extensive gardens of an old country house. The countryside around was some of the most beautiful in England.

The college was involved in the general expansion in teacher training after 1961, and the problems that accompanied it. The growth from 350 in 1961, when this research started, to 950 when it finished in 1968 was planned alongside many revisions of the curriculum. In 1960 the balance of training in the colleges was changed to increase the supply of primary school teachers. The college had to plan this as it prepared for the three-year course which was due to start in 1962. The publication of the Robbins Report in 1963 was followed by planning for the BEd degree. At Worcester, this work was increased by the decision to negotiate with the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) to produce a degree more closely geared to the needs of teachers and to give the college control over its own syllabuses. In 1965, new plans for expansion had to be prepared under the Department of Education and Science (DES) request for emergency measures to increase the supply of teachers from the colleges, with major capital expenditure. Finally, in 1967, the government of the college was being reorganised in line with the recommendations of the Weaver Committee. This burden of reorganisation accompanied the problems of expansion.

Three phases of development are distinguished in the analysis that follows. In the first phase from 1946 to 1949 the college was officially on a temporary basis only, giving a one-year course under the post-war emergency regulations. The second phase from 1949 to 1962 started with official recognition of the college as permanent. There was a two-year course and the numbers fluctuated between 300 and 350 students. The third phase started with the expansion that accompanied the start of the third-year course. Numbers rose in 1962 to 550. There were 610 in 1964, 890 in 1966 and 950 in 1968. At the same time from 1962 to 1968 the number of staff rose from 30 to 90. The expansion was supposed to stop in 1968, apart from the increase due to the presence of the first fourth-year BEd students.

(1) The First Phase, 1946 - 1949

A picture of the early years of the college was built up from college and union council records, and by questions to staff and students returning to college for reunions. While those who attended reunions inevitably gave a rosy picture, the documentary evidence confirmed that this was a critical period in setting the pattern of social and academic life. The staff arrived in 1946 to find a

deserted service camp. The facilities for the college were those left by the Royal Air Force. Staff swept out, arranged classrooms, offices and sleeping accommodation in time to meet the students as they were demobilised. Staff and students were mostly just out of the armed forces and students sometimes held the higher military rank. An analysis of their ages gave the mean age of the staff as only one month older than that of the students. Only 3 of the original 15 staff had previously worked in a training college. Social and academic life was organised to serve the particular needs of the participants rather than as a copy of existing practice.

Socially, life had to be a joint effort. All had to clean up and prepare rooms. All had to join in to make up teams, plays and choirs. In the first one-year course, 5 plays, a one act play festival, 3 concerts were performed, a full range of sports organised, a debating society formed and a weekly news-sheet and magazine produced. Within this year the basic pattern of activity that was to persist to the present was laid down. But it was also in this year that the organisation of staff and students into a common social unit, the institution of a personal group system linking a member of staff with a dozen students, and the norm that all should join in communal activity were established.

The feeling that this college was a uniquely happy place, expressed repeatedly in questionnaires seemed to be derived from this year. The ending of the one-year courses in 1949, and of the two-year course in 1961, did little to disturb this. Furthermore, this feeling was founded on tangible benefits springing from the egalitarian origins. There were none of the stringent regulations common in established colleges because they were designed from the first by adults for adults. Staff-student relations were close because both ex-service men and women had problems and wanted to talk them over as equals. The staff belonged to the union society because their money as well as their skills were necessary to get social life started. An indication of the impression caused by these early years can be gauged from the return of 50 per cent of the students from the first two years of the college to the reunion in 1949.

The administrative system that developed in this early period reflected the quality of communal life. Communications were informal and administrative staff were fully involved in social life with tutors and students. Similarly academic work was organised to suit the needs of these older, experienced students who had to receive a full training within a year. Priority was given to teaching practice and the development of skills in teaching a wide range of subjects, rather than to a narrow range of academic subjects.

(2) The Second Phase, 1949 - 1961

The college did not expand in this period. It remained in the original pre-fabricated buildings with almost all students and staff resident. These buildings were altered to give a central section which contained the administrative, lecture and common room accommodation. The residential and tutorial rooms radiated out from this central section, so that staff and students were frequently moving through it and passing each other's accommodation. No buildings were

completely specialised. This physical layout gave a high density of activity and movement It helped to maximise personal contacts and to give publicity for events as all took place within this small area.

The investigation started in the summer of 1961. The tutorial staff at this time were very involved in the social life of the college. They were full members of the union society, attended meetings, served on committees with students, acted in plays, played in games teams, and this participation was approved and demanded by students in their magazine and election speeches. This involvement applied also to academic work. Staff accepted diffuse responsibilities and students expected these to be fulfilled. Some indication of the satisfaction of staff with this situation can be gauged from their turnover, which was the lowest in the area of the Birmingham Institute. In the whole period from 1946 to 1961 the staff averaged 35. Yet only 11 had left the college for other posts. Consequently few new staff had arrived and of these replacements 3 were themselves ex-students. All were rapidly involved in the social life of the college.

The personal group system, whereby a member of staff and a dozen or more students met weekly to discuss college business and to serve as the lower tier of union society, was institutionalised early in this middle period. The personal tutor kept contact with individuals in his group and helped them when necessary. He also dealt with problems arising out of a student's work and collected together, and commented on final grades for confidential reports The group meetings were given a half hour on the time-table per week, under a student leader. Some met regularly in tutors' homes and organised dinners or visits to the theatre as a group. Others met infrequently and just for the necessary business. The majority met regularly at the appointed time and occasionally during the year for coffee in the room of a student or the tutor.

It soon became apparent that there was a high level of interaction between academic, professional and social aspects. None could be treated in isolation. Social life was a major factor behind working habits and academic aspirations. Professional preparation involved close personal relations between staff and students, and high participation in social activity. Finally, the emphasis on teaching as a common concern, and the pragmatic attitudes of students towards it, influenced their attitudes towards academic work. Further, all these activities took place within an historically determined set of values and norms that faced staff and students with clearly defined roles backed by strong informal sanctions.

Secondly, there was a strong, positive identification with the college as a community in which relations were essentially particularistic. The former was expressed in terms of the "Worcester spirit". This kept appearing in student news sheets, old students' magazines and as an explanation of behaviour in responses to interviews and questionnaires. Students seem to feel a genuine affection for the college which acted as a motivation for behaviour within it and persisted after leaving. This feeling of belonging reinforced the particularistic basis of social relations. Judgement was made primarily on the basis of personal qualities because everyone knew everyone else and all

shared a common social life within a community that engaged their affection. Sociologists will recognise this as a typical gemeinschaft situation, with all the gains and losses involved in this.

Few organisational or academic changes took place in this period. The early experimental arrangements were systematised, but without fundamentally changing their character. In 1961 the college was running smoothly, had established a national reputation for good academic standards and as an attractive college for both students and staff to work in. Administration, academic work and social life had evolved within a small college, with little stress resulting from competition or the assessment system, and very close personal relations within and between staff and students. After 1961 these conditions all changed.

(3) The Third Phase, 1961 - 1968

From 1946 to 1962, administration, residential and teaching accommodation were in the same blocks of pre-fabricated buildings. From 1962 administration and teaching accommodation were moved to a new block, separated from the old, which remained residential only. Consequently, tutorial and administrative staff no longer circulated in corridors near student study-bedrooms as they did their work. Thus the number of casual contacts was reduced. This trend was accentuated by the physical separation of staff and student dining and common rooms in the new building. This removed another physical feature which had maintained contacts.

This isolation of residential accommodation also had a detrimental effect on communications and participation. There was now no single point through which staff and students passed continuously during the day. Notice boards had to be placed in a number of places instead of being concentrated in one strategic spot. It became increasingly difficult to advertise events to the whole community. But this separation also meant a walk to get to organised social activity. The halls and common rooms had previously been in the residential blocks, and students went to organised activities which were in adjoining rooms. Once this activity took place in the new blocks, a special effort had to be made. Further, while the new accommodation provided better facilities for dancing, acting, debating and singing, it was no longer in the intimate style of the students' own rooms, but in rooms usually used for teaching.

Up to 1964, all general course students lived on the campus except a few day students. In 1964 the first 50 women went into lodgings. In 1968 only 56% of students were resident in college, with 316 in lodgings. These were almost all within a radius of a mile. Students were provided with full refectory facilities in the college. In addition there were specially built bases where lodging students could study, keep books and spare clothing, wash and iron their clothes and enjoy good common room facilities. These proportions in residence have to be seen in relation to the tendency of student teachers to choose colleges near their homes. Taylor found that one third of all college students finishing their courses in 1967 were living less than 30 miles from

their colleges[1]. In this study in the same year 31 per cent were in this category.

Accompanying this increase in students living out was a continual fall in the proportion of resident staff. All the original staff had lived in flats within the student residential blocks. By 1968 only 16 of the 90 staff were still resident and housing conditions had forced many to live at a distance. This was partly due to the falling proportion of single women on the staff. The new appointments after 1961 tended to be married men, and from 1966 married women, with established family interests outside the college.

Expansion started in 1962 within a stable community that had developed strong expressive tendencies. Tutorial and administrative staff as well as students were tightly integrated. A distinctive blueprint for living persisted, despite the coming and going of students. There was a very low level of tension. This expressive quality was sustained at some cost in instrumental achievement. The academic and professional goals of staff had been adjusted to the poor motivation of some students. Such an allocation of priorities within the college was possible because of the nature of teacher education. This was seen as a personal matter requiring, above all, close personal relations and consensus over values.

From 1962 this equilibrium had been under increased pressure. This came partly from the necessity for making organisational changes to cope with increased numbers and partly from the changing attitudes of staff and students. Consequently, as organisation became more specialised, so staff and student cultures began to separate. Old groups and activities binding them together in many-sided activity were replaced by formal committees having specific purposes. Yet the evaluation of the college as a place of close, friendly relations persisted. The cultural factors were not only the most important, they were the most persistent. The actual patterns of social interaction had changed, but without an accompanying change in their evaluation.

The changes in the organisation of social life had started in 1962 when the college expanded from 350 to 500. But in 1966, with over 800 students, there was no sign that the reduced opportunities for participation had diminished the feeling that this was a college that provided a full social life. By 1968, with 950 students the idea of a college "spirit" was more frequently used as a joke in public. But in interviews, students still used the idea to explain their actions and the attempts to reform constitutions and organise events were debated in terms of reviving the old spirit. Even at this size, when most relationships were impersonal and most procedures had been formalised, there was still a persistence of values derived from the smaller college and these still acted as occasional motives for action.

From 1965 attempts were made by the students to check the decline in organised social activity. Most of these concentrated on involving incoming first-year students in clubs and societies by recruiting campaigns and extra publicity. An Arts Festival was instituted. Many social activities were started which were not part of the curriculum, yet involved staff as well as

students and were an extension of courses in Drama, Dance, Music and Literature. Above all, there was a proliferation of specialist clubs, supplementing the older, multi-purpose societies. The delay of the arrival of first-year students helped to reduce the confusion often felt when the whole college returned together. However, much of this effort was counteracted by the decision of the students that those to go into lodgings should be selected from the first-year group. The results of this research were given to the students at the end of each year and possibly helped to stimulate action. However, although largely unsuccessful the efforts were made and were mainly motivated by the feeling that something important was being lost as organised social activity involved fewer staff and students.

Similarly, the increased size, the growing specialisation among staff and the greater stress on academic performance with the introduction of the BEd after 1965 had not entirely eliminated the priority given to personality in assessment. Students and staff still judged each other in terms of friendliness and co-operation rather than qualification or academic performance. As contacts became less frequent, more reliance had to be placed on marks and written assessments, but even the final grading of students was discussed in terms of who they were rather than how they had performed.

Finally, the social life in the college was related to academic and professional work. While colleges preparing teachers only give a narrow range of experience, the students have no worry over an eventual career. Further, continuous assessment removed much of the strain associated with examinations. Students were under little pressure to work very hard and had little anxiety over their final results. The only periods of serious tension were before or during teaching practice. Consequently there was not the pressure of competitive examinations, or anxiety over performance that may strain personal relations in other institutions of higher education.

This foundation of close personal relations among students and staff, and between the two groups, was reinforced by the methods of professional preparation. The personal characteristics of students were judged to be as important as their academic ability. Their potential as teachers was enhanced by their active participation in social life. Guidance required close relations between staff and students, particularly around teaching practice time. The system of continuous assessment, whereby course work counted for as much or more than examination results, was a symptom of this conviction that teaching potential could be detected and reinforced by close contacts. Furthermore, academic work was organised on a basis of groups of 16 students working under a tutor in order to maximise personal contact. Many colleges employed a "college mark" as part of this system, based on personal qualities and carrying great weight in the final assessment of students.

The most important feature of the formal organisation was its awareness of the importance of the communal life and its efforts to support it. The support given throughout to this research was only one part of this effort. The priority given to special accommodation for students in residence was another. This sensitivity to communal problems was possible because the administration

was involved with staff and students. In 1961 administrative staff played a full part in union society activities. This decreased with expansion and was stopped in 1967 by a change in the constitution of student affairs. In this year, student committees had been set up to counter the decline in informal contacts. This continued intimacy despite the inevitable growth of decision making by committee. rather than through casual contact, was possible because official regulations on student life had been minimised. By comparison with other colleges they were liberal and were enforced through informal student controls rather than college rules.

In the years of this study after 1961 many attempts had been made to reform the structure of the student union. These tended to have the support of staff who were establishing their own social life as they grew in numbers. Most of these movements concentrated on separating the administrative functions of the personal group from its function as a link between staff and students. As staff were originally full members of the union society, the personal groups were used to discuss union society affairs and feed resolutions into union council. However, although staff mainly supported attempts to remove this function from the groups, the majority of students blocked such attempts. Only in 1966/67 was this removal accomplished and a new constitution drafted, in which staff were no longer members of union society and in which personal groups served a purely pastoral function.

In theory the system was to continue unchanged, with tutors still having personal responsibility for a group of students. But from September 1967 there was no time allowed for meetings on the time-table and staff were instructed to concentrate on helping incoming first-year students rather than meeting a group from all three years. A routine was established for the first weeks of term to allow tutors to meet their new students. The result was that a majority of tutors made no further contact with second or third year students. Indeed, the speed with which contacts were allowed to lapse indicated the superficiality of many of the organised contacts. This collapse of the organised system was predicted from the criticisms of students in the questionnaires and the unenthusiastic attitude of many tutors. In 1968 staff and students had separate and joint meetings on the possibility of a new system. It was agreed that there could be no return to the old form of multi-purpose groups, and the individual relation was maintained, with particular concentration on the new intake.

In 1967 the administration was also formalised. Five new committees were set up in this year to link students with tutorial and administrative staff. A new enquiry office was built, through which written communications from students to tutorial staff were to pass. Contacts with administration were also to be made through this office by students and tutorial staff, instead of making a direct approach. To facilitate this a number of forms were duplicated to reduce the previous dependence on verbal communication.

By 1968 tutorial staff who had originally held an appointment in two subject areas had been incorporated into subject departments, which now started to gather in exclusive groups in the senior common room. There were a number of sub-committees of the academic board, and the senior common

room now excluded all but senior administrative staff. The students had evolved an autonomous union society constitution and a massive committee structure. There was a joint academic board sub-committee, student representation on some academic board sub-committees and a number of departmental staff-student committees. The crucial number was around 500 students. Below this it had been possible to sustain a personal, informal organisation. Above that tensions developed that made a new formal organisation necessary.

METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

The data used in this monograph were extracted from a follow-up study of the college as an organisation undergoing rapid change[2]. Hence the methods were designed to investigate not only social activity and staff-student relations, but academic and professional work. This comprehensive approach finished at the end of 1965 and from then until July 1968 only the investigation into the social aspects reported here was continued, although the interaction between social and working life made a rigid definition of the field impossible.

There were four basic elements in the research design: individual interviews and group discussion, questionnaires, collection of data on selected indices of social activity, and the content analysis of records and documents. This diffused design was originally adopted because it was impossible to predict which methods would be most useful. Later, it was found that the different methods could be used to check the reliability of any one measure. It was found that questionnaires were particularly open to distortion due to the involvement of students in any matters related to teaching. There was a tendency to give answers that students thought were "right" rather than those that were really true. This was aggravated by the strong normative pressures to which they were exposed in the college.

The interview programme initially included a sample of 128 students selected from the intakes of 1961, 1962 and 1963. This involved one focused interview of about 30 minutes. This was dropped when the results from a smaller interview panel of 8 students from each successive intake were found to give equally valuable results. Each student in the panel was interviewed three times a year while in college. The object was to supplement the information being gathered by questionnaires on changes in attitudes and behaviour while on the three-year course. There were additional interview programmes with headteachers of schools used for practice and with interviewees for places in the college. Small group discussions were used to examine further the ideas that arose in these interviews. They were also valuable in checking the validity of interview results.

A number of standard tests were used to collect information on students, but most of the 15 questionnaires used were aimed at gathering data on attitudes.

Staff-student relations were investigated by measuring the knowledge that staff had of students as well as the contacts between them. The actual contacts, and attitudes towards them, were investigated by a questionnaire derived from one used in the University of Manchester in 1962[3]. Originally the idea was to provide comparative data, but the number and quality of the contacts in the college compared with the university meant that the categories in the schedule had to be changed. The highest frequency of contact in the latter turned out to be the lowest in the college. The amended schedule was

used on the whole college of 471 students in 1963 and on a sample of 95 first and third years in 1965, to measure not only change in the intake due to increased use of lodgings, but to detect changes across the course. Finally the same schedule was used again in 1967 on a stratified sample of 130 students in all years. Staff filled in a recognition test of students for each third year from 1963 to 1968. This consisted only of staff checking a list of student names to see who they would be able to recognise by sight.

Students also kept a diary of their personal activities during the month of November 1961. This was not repeated as it had a low rate of completion (59%) and its personal nature threatened the rapport on which the study depended. Two diaries of friendship were kept in 1963 and 1967 wherein students indicated the sex and year group in which they found their friends. Again, the reliability of these diaries was probably low, although students in the interview sample appeared to have filled in the details conscientiously.

In some cases, such as the 1963 questionnaire on staff-student relations, all students (471) were included. In others, stratified random samples were used. Many were completed by students using a code number so that various schedules filled in by the same student could be related, yet response rates never fell below 80 per cent for questionnaires, and of 32 applications of the 15 questionnaires, only four response rates were below 90 per cent.

Information on social activity was collected in three ways. First, all secretaries were asked to collect the names of anyone attending an activity in two periods of two weeks in the autumn and summer terms of each year. Secondly, the names of anyone performing in plays, opera, revues or choirs from the stage were collected. Thirdly, four activities, dances, religious service, debating society and rugby support were selected and six dates sampled in each year for the collection of the number involved. The dances proved too difficult for numbers to be counted and were abandoned as an index, and in 1967 the pattern of the religious service was changed so this too could no longer be compared. During these half yearly survey periods, students were used by the researcher to take random checks on the reliability of the returns for particular activities.

An intensive study was made of the 1961 intake. This was the crucial year group. They entered the small two year college. In their second year they formed part of the expanded college with a third year. Finally they became a third year while the rest of the college had only known the conditions after expansion had started. They were the one group who could compare the old with the new. They were also the first year affected by the changed balance of training and included the first junior-secondary groups of this balance. They were given a battery of standard tests at the start and finish of their course. Each was given a code number to enable the results of individuals to be compared across the three years. Unfortunately this served mainly to show the unsuitability of the tests under these conditions, for individual scores, even on characteristics such as introversion-extraversion, tough-tender mindedness or radicalism-conservatism, fluctuated almost at random, even though group averages changed little.

A variety of documents was made available for the study from college records in addition to weekly newsletters and annual magazines. These included a number of surveys carried out in the early years to help assess needs of students. The most useful were the minutes of academic board and student union council meetings. There were also a number of reports on the college from inspectors, external examiners and assessors.

All the methods used depended on the response of student and staff who were involved with the researcher in the college. The dependence on follow-up meant that any mistake in strategy that would aggravate respondents had to be avoided. This was particularly difficult as students could have been identified from their schedules. Yet it was also necessary to feed the information back to the students and staff so that remedial action could be taken. While high response rates were maintained, the need to avoid annoying respondents and the involvement of the researcher in the college inevitably meant that the selection and interpretation of data was biased.

The possibility of bias was increased by the loose structure of the interviewing. The focused interview technique was used because it would enable any interesting points which emerged to be pursued. However, a more rigid schedule would have reduced the interplay between interviewer and interviewee and also the resulting bias. Even the questionnaires were not free of this bias as they too were shown to be influenced by the environment in which they were filled in.

The necessity to take the whole institutional context into consideration for policy decisions also applied to research strategy. Many early attempts to use questionnaires were abandoned once the influence of the institution on the answers had been detected. Students did not just answer, they interpreted the questions in the light of the conditions in the college and their own position as teachers in training. One example of this was in 1961 when 43 out of 121 students had to be rejected as respondents through scoring over 10 points on the Lie scale of the Maudsley Personality Inventory. In interviews and group discussions the reasons given were that the Lie answers, although obviously not reflecting the actual behaviour of the student, seemed to them to be the answer they, as teachers, should give. Similarly a questionnaire on attitudes to teaching was answered as an examination paper in educational theory instead of as a genuine attempt to gauge actual opinions. Only the use of a number of cross-checking methods enabled this bias to be detected. It meant that questionnaires measuring attitudes could not be used unless checked by interviews and small group discussions. While this was probably a feature of the small college only, it may be a serious fault in any study where questionnaires are used without accompanying institutional analysis[4].

Such a follow-up of a single college has obvious limitations as a basis for generalisation. Indeed, one of the major conclusions in 1965 was that the college had not only developed a distinctive culture, but that this was the most important determinant of behaviour and even of responses to the research. Nevertheless, expansion was reducing the strength of norms established in the small, stable college up to 1962, and the trends analysed here are probably shared by other expanding institutions.

Another limitation on the reliability of the methods was the time spanned by the research. Most of the information was gathered by a combination of panel interviewing, repeated questionnaires and regular collection of the numbers involved in activities, selected in advance as indices of participation and staff-student relations. However, during the seven years, the same changes that were being investigated necessitated alterations in methods, thus making comparisons at different dates more difficult. This was aggravated by the operational nature of the research, as the results were used as a basis for reforms. Some of the activities chosen as indices stopped or changed so radically that they could not be compared. Similarly, questions asked in 1962 became meaningless by 1966. The different pattern of social life in 1968 required different techniques for investigation than did the small college in 1962. Indeed, it is doubtful if a college of over 500 students can be investigated in any intensive way with limited resources.

A final limitation on reliability was the involvement of the writer in the college. A variety of research techniques were used to check on the consequent bias, but objectivity was reduced by the need to participate fully. Even where data were gathered through questionnaires, or by students acting as research assistants, the interpretation must be tinged by personal emotions. The affection of the author for the college is therefore a necessary guide to the reader. The willingness with which staff, students, ex-students and teachers in local schools co-operated made it more difficult to sustain neutrality.

RESULTS

(1) Social Activity and Participation

The level of organised and informal social activity in a college is not only an index of its expressive quality. The degree of interaction among students and staff, and between them, determines the degree of integration, the maintenance of distinctive institutional values and the ease with which tensions can be managed. But social interaction also has important effects on the instrumental goals of the college. At one extreme, the dominance of an adolescent sub-culture giving prestige to the athlete or the sociable will devalue academic work[5]. Similarly a "collegiate" student sub-culture giving priority to having fun will produce poor working habits. At the other extreme, an "academic" sub-culture will promote interests supported by the tutorial staff.

In colleges of education the dominant sub-culture tends to be "vocational", focussing on teaching as a profession. But it is within peer groups and in social interaction that students consolidate their identification with their careers. Becker and Carper found that spending years in training provided the necessary skills and the incentive to identify with the relevant profession but self-conceptions were established only when others treated the individual as a professional[6]. The qualification that colleges of education give their students is of value only in teaching. The investment of time therefore provides a great incentive to identify with teaching. The continual association with others training only to teach maximises the pressure for commitment to teaching. There are obvious disadvantages in this situation, but for better or worse, participation in social activity has professional significance, for it reduces the number who leave the colleges regardless of the quality of the students concerned Wastage is only likely among isolates. Out of an original interview sample of 128 students in the small college between 1961 and 1963, only 3 expressed doubts about teaching in all their years in college and did not start teaching after leaving. Wastage from all causes fluctuated around 8 per cent throughout the study.

Throughout the description that follows of changes in the pattern of social life, the unchanging appreciation of the students must be considered. In 1961, 90 per cent of students expressed themselves very or reasonably satisfied with social life in the college. In 1963 this still held for 87 per cent, in 1965 for 89 per cent and in 1967 for 88 per cent. There was no reduction in this satisfaction after students left, as two samples who were teaching expressed the same opinions. The follow-through nature of these questions in 1961, 1963, 1965 and 1967 showed that there was no falling off in satisfaction after students had spent time in the college. Finally there was no difference in the attitudes between those resident in college and those in lodgings in the years 1965 and 1967. This state of affairs was anticipated by students before arrival. Not only had 26 per cent of the interview sample, and 24 per cent of

the sample of applicants for places, had the college recommended to them by friends as a good place to live in, but all applicants seemed to have gathered this from the day they had spent in the college while being interviewed.

Three cautions are necessary as a foreward to this section. Firstly, the comparisons must be viewed in relation to the very high level of activity at the start of the study. In 1962, 50 per cent of men and 15 per cent of women played in, or actively supported, games teams. 50 per cent of men and 25 per cent of women were also engaged at some time in the year in rehearsals for plays, concerts, opera or revues. Secondly, a high level of communal activity is not necessarily virtuous and it may indicate an undesirable introversion. However, the view taken here is that such a high level was appreciated by students, increased staff-student contacts and had definite professional advantages for intending teachers. Thirdly, while actual opportunities to participate declined, students still felt that they should be joining in. Diminished activity was consequently a continual subject of student concern and of attempts at improvement.

This concern over social activity was expressed in interviews in a way that indicated a discrepancy between the objective situation as measured by the survey and the perception of individual students of their own participation. Most thought that the college was getting less lively, but were convinced that they were personally active, although this was not borne out by the investigation. There seemed to be a feeling that it was proper to participate. In the face of this they rationalised their own situation by extending the definition of organised activity to include their own interaction within a small group of friends.

Table 1 summarises the results of two indices of activity. Although collected from different sources, by different methods, they show the same pattern of change, wherein expansion was not accompanied by increased activity. The figures for 1957 to 1960, collected from college records, are similar to those collected from 1961/62. In this long phase of the 1950s, with around 300 students taking a two-year course, a high, constant level of activity had been established, heavily involving a majority of students, and tailored to the needs of a small, tightly integrated community. Men not only had more opportunity for participation but tended to dominate student union affairs. There was also considerable staff participation in all organised student social activity.

In 1962/63 when the first third year course expanded numbers by over a third, there was an initial rise in the level of activity. These students staying on had learned to participate in the smaller college. Hence the total level of activity on both indices was greater than in any period before or since. Interviews during this period showed staff and students at their most enthusiastic. The advantages of increased size seemed to have been combined with older communal activity.

Underneath this enthusiasm, which is also noticeable in official accounts of the impact of the third year, was a trend that was to continue throughout the expansion that followed to meet the rising demand for teachers. The expansion

Table 1. Number of activities per head, measured on two indices from '61 to 1968.

Index A = number of activities during two, two week samples of all students' union activity
Index B = number taking part in major activities finally requiring an audience

Year	Number in college			Total number of activities						Activities per head					
				Index A			Index B			Index A			Index B		
	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All
1957/58	110	170	280	-	-	-	276	226	502	-	-	-	2.5	1.3	1.8
1958/59	115	163	278	-	-	-	198	237	435	-	-	-	1.7	1.5	1.6
1959/60	114	174	288	-	-	-	200	308	508	-	-	-	1.8	1.7	1.7
1961/62	113	166	279	830	810	1640	216	257	473	7.3	4.9	5.9	1.9	1.6	1.7
1962/63	201	276	477	1100	820	1920	255	300	555	5.5	3.0	4.0	1.3	1.1	1.2
1963/64	212	286	498	900	820	1720	216	301	517	4.2	2.9	3.5	1.0	1.1	1.0
1964/65	224	317	541	730	580	1310	177	247	424	3.3	1.8	2.4	0.8	0.8	0.8
1965/66	247	406	653	678	767	1445	203	262	465	2.7	1.9	2.2	0.8	0.7	0.7
1966/67	295	527	822	629	746	1375	223	280	503	2.1	1.4	1.7	0.7	0.5	0.6
1967/68	327	562	889	996	868	1864	254	271	525	3.0	1.6	2.1	0.8	0.5	0.6

of total activity concealed a fall in activity per head, particularly among those students in their first year. This was due to reduced participation, not the organisation of fewer activities. Many more were inactive and were learning the new, more passive definition of the role of student. The inelastic nature of the pattern of activity, built into the social structure of the college. steadily reduced activity per head from 1962 to 1967.

The final break from the old normative structure which led students to an active involvement in common activities came in 1964/65. At this time the last year to have entered the small college had left and all years had learned the new norms. Total activity on both indices was at its lowest. From this time organisers of traditional activities such as one act plays, choirs, debates and going-down festivities found it difficult to attract participants or audiences. Students were no longer motivated to take advantage of activities established to cater for a college of half the size. One index of this was the rapid fall in the numbers returning for old students weekends after 1966, from recent leavers. In 1962 over half the students from the previous leavers had returned. In 1968 most of the activities had to be cancelled because there was not enough support. Yet students from the early years of the college returned year after year.

By 1964/65 the rapid decline in communal activity was over. This was partly because the level was now so low that a further fall was unlikely anyway. It was also partly because of the results of this survey which brought a realisation that the quality of social life had suffered. From this time there were attempts to provide activities that were suitable for a college that could no longer rely on spontaneous communication, pressure to join in and on organised activity which seemed to be merely an extension of the informal. Intensive recruiting among new intakes. an arts festival combining outside artists with student performances, and the promotion of activities combining the work of subject departments with leisure time activity, helped check the decline.

By 1967 there were signs that some success had been achieved and that a new equilibrium had been reached. Total activity had started to rise and in 1967/68 activity per head had stopped falling. The new pattern was similar to the old only in providing more opportunities for men than women. In many other ways it reflected the change from a small scale community to a larger association. First, many new activities either brought in outsiders or took place outside college. Second, staff were now largely excluded. whereas in the small college their contribution was both needed and requested. Thirdly, more activity was organised by societies of subject departments. Lastly, and most important. there was a change in the pattern of participation.

Table 2 illustrates these trends in three selected activities, participation in which did not necessitate membership of any particular club but was open to all. Six dates were sampled in each year and students collected the numbers present at these times. In 1967 the religious service was no longer time-tabled to free all students for possible attendance and this meant that there could no longer be comparability. Table 2 shows the overall decline and the effect of efforts at stimulation from 1964 which checked the fall. The importance of these activities, and the reason for their selection, is that they are indices of

communal participation. They show how the pressure to join in had lessened with size. This more than any other factor determined the changing pattern of participation. But while new specialised activities had checked the overall drop in the level of activity, there was no apparent recovery in activities which were open to the whole college. In many ways these were the more significant indicators.

Table 2. Average students' attendance at three selected activities from 1961 to 1968. (The average number attending, with, in brackets, the attendance expressed as a percentage of the total number of students)

	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68
Religious service	127(45%)	112(23%)	98 (20%)	134(25%)	92 (14%)	73 (9%)	-
Debating society	64(23%)	48(10%)	52(10%)	25 (5%)	55 (9%)	61 (7%)	62 (6%)
Rugby matches (supporters only)	23 (8%)	18 (4%)	12 (3%)	23 (4%)	18 (3%)	31 (4%)	32 (4%)

(a) Participation

Reduced activity per head could have resulted from either a sharing of available opportunities between more students without any increase in total communal activity, or from a growing number of inactive students as the college expanded. It could also have resulted from a redistribution between year groups, particularly after 1965, once first year women began to spend their first year in lodgings.

The figures for Index A in Table 1, collected from secretaries of all clubs and societies in the student union and including the actual names of those participating were used to compile the tables that follow.

Table 3 shows that while all students became less active, this was most marked among first year students. This trend developed once expansion came with the three-year course. While the main impact of declining participation inevitably fell on those just entering the college there was also no sign that this had been checked by later efforts to stimulate activity. Those entering in 1965 and 1966 had, in their second and third years in 1967, participated to a greater extent than those in the preceding two years, but the first year men and women continued to be less active. This was confirmed by analysing activity within

the first sampled fortnight in the first term of the year. Among the men, participation fell from 5.2 in 1961 to 1.1 in 1967 and for women from 3.7 to 0.3 in the same period. Incoming students were hardly involved at all in the expanding college.

Table 3. Activity per head of men and women in each year group, in two, two-week periods of activity, 1961 to 1968.

Year of intake	Year of course in college					
	First		Second		Third	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1960	-	-	8.1	4.5	5.1	3.5
1961	7.6	5.1	5.9	3.7	4.2	3.3
1962	5.5	2.0	4.2	3.3	4.1	2.5
1963	3.9	2.2	3.2	2.1	3.0	2.1
1964	2.4	1.1	2.5	1.9	2.7	1.4
1965	2.6	1.7	2.9	1.4	3.8	2.1
1966	2.2	0.9	3.5	1.5	-	-
1967	1.6	1.0	-	-	-	-

Table 4 shows that the fall in activity per head was due to an increasing proportion of inactive students rather than a sharing of opportunities. By 1968 half the men and three quarters of the women students had participated in under 7 activities during the six, two-week sample periods taken during the three years they had been in college. Indeed, a separate analysis of the most active 10 per cent of students represented in Table 4 showed that they had increased their share of all activities from 28 per cent for the 1961 intake to 37 per cent for those entering in 1965. Thus an inactive majority coupled with an active minority replaced a more equitable distribution in the smaller college.

Table 4. Level of participation and percentage of students in each category for intakes from 1961 to 1965 who completed the three-year course by 1968 (percentages in brackets).

Year of entry	Sex	Number of activities engaged in during three years				
		Under 7	7-13	14-20	21-34	Over 35
1961	Men	11 (22)	10 (19)	9 (16)	14 (25)	10 (19)
	Women	18 (19)	27 (29)	23 (25)	21 (23)	3 (3)
1962	Men	23 (29)	19 (24)	16 (20)	18 (22)	4 (5)
	Women	54 (52)	29 (28)	15 (15)	5 (5)	0 (0)
1963	Men	25 (34)	25 (33)	18 (24)	6 (8)	0 (0)
	Women	50 (55)	26 (29)	14 (15)	0 (0)	0 (0)
1964	Men	39 (56)	17 (24)	8 (12)	4 (6)	1 (1)
	Women	99 (76)	28 (21)	5 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
1965	Men	51 (51)	21 (21)	15 (15)	13 (13)	0 (0)
	Women	143 (76)	28 (15)	9 (5)	8 (4)	0 (0)

An examination of those students who had never participated during their three years' residence in college showed that they were frequently members of a small group of inactive friends, or had a girl or boy friend within the college with whom they spent much of their leisure time. Among the 1962 intake there were 9 women and 4 men who never appeared at any activity, 2 of the men and 5 of the women were courting steadily throughout the three years and 2 of the women spent most of their time together. By 1968 a majority were using small groups rather than communal activity for their leisure.

The high participants tended not only to monopolise activities, but also to become officers of the union society. Thus in the 1961 intake the 4 most active men also shared between them 5 senior administrative posts in the union and produced two full length plays, two one-act plays, numerous revues and helped take a play to the Edinburgh Festival. Two of them were continually in trouble because they did little academic work. The whole 1961 intake spent an average of 7 hours per week in organised student activity. The most active 5 per cent spent an average of 16 hours per week. In some cases, in the smaller college, students seemed to have a compulsion to participate that was probably as neurotic as that of the complete isolate.

During the period from 1961 to 1968, interviews with students showed that they were aware of the change. In interviews and in hustings and student newsletters, the decline was associated with a lack of college "spirit". There was still the feeling that students should participate fully, but the necessary motivation was missing among a majority. In a college that had expanded threefold in 7 years, it was difficult to raise teams for games, casts for plays and singers for choirs, even though the numbers required had not increased in the period.

(b) Informal, unorganised social activity

It proved very difficult to collect any reliable data on informal activity and the re-allocation of time previously spent on organised activity. Data were gathered continuously from the interview panel. Students in 1961 kept diaries of their activities for a month. In 1963 and 1968 students kept a diary of their network of friends for a two-monthly period.

Students in the small college were very involved within the campus. During the month of November 1961 most students only left the college once a week, mainly to shop or to go to the cinema. Few left the college at weekends and Friday evening had its full share of organised activity. Most of this activity centred in student study-bedrooms. The "coffee brew" provided for a small group to chat informally and such groups sometimes attained the standing of an exclusive club, some even giving themselves names. Staff were often invited to these "brews", particularly after a lecture or a meal.

By 1965 there was more movement out of college. The numbers leaving college on Fridays to go home for the weekend from one men's and one women's hall of residence were checked in 1962 and 1968. Among men, the increase was from 9 to 12 per cent and for women from 15 to 24 per cent. This however was a poor index of net movement as most of this was for short periods using cars. In 1961, two small car parks had been more than sufficient. By 1967 there were three small and two large parking areas, often overflowing. By 1965, Friday evenings, previously busy with activity, had to be abandoned as useless for getting audiences or participants.

There was also an increase in activities in student rooms rather than in halls or lecture rooms. Dancing to pop music, singing folk music to guitar accompaniment could take place in a limited space and became very popular. In 1967 an internal closed circuit radio station broadcast music and items of joint interest to student rooms. By this time students had their own union building and students in lodgings had a comfortable, purpose-built base in college which became a centre for relaxation. In these ways, energy that had previously been given to organised activity was channelled into informal activity. The physical expansion of the college encouraged this by separating student residential quarters from halls and rooms used for games, plays, debates and meetings. In the small college an activity could be heard in student rooms. Students going to a meeting would tell others about it. Debates were

held in the only student common room where evening coffee was available. The provision of specialist facilities had helped open a gap between formal and informal activity which had previously been difficult to discern.

The friendship networks that formed were rarely restricted to a single year. In 1963, 28 out of 39 students who completed their diaries had the majority of their friends in years other than their own. While men tended to have a more balanced distribution of friends between the sexes, there was only one case where a student mixed with only his own sex. A third of the 1961 intake were courting and, after a few weeks in college, had either the same partner throughout their three years in the college or were engaged to someone outside.

By 1967, when all first year women were in lodgings their pattern of interaction was different from previous years. A comparison between the friendships of this intake in their first year and those of the 1963 intake showed that the patterns for men had not changed. The women however not only knew fewer students in all years in 1967, but a greater proportion of those they did know came from the first year. Students blamed this on the provision of a special lodgings base in which these first year women could remain detached.

In the same studies of friendships, students were asked where they made friends. In both periods, coffee brews and academic groups were ranked first and second respectively, but in 1967 the order was reversed. Friendships were not only tending to be confined within the same intakes, but within the same subject groups. Students in coffee brews were not only becoming more homogeneous, but staff were excluded by 1968. This was partly due to the physical separation of staff from student accommodation on an expanded site, but was also part of a more general separation among students on the basis of years in college, among staff on the basis of subject, and between staff and students as each obtained its own facilities. By 1967 new students and staff did not expect to share each other's activities.

(2) Staff-Student Relations

The investigation into staff-student relations was facilitated by the concern of both staff and students that there should be no deterioration. This feeling derived not only from the common involvement in social life, but from the feeling that there was a professional benefit to be derived from close relations. The criticisms that follow were mainly directed towards increasing the number of contacts, and concentrated on possible ways of organising this. No other subject was so well documented by either students or staff. It was the subject of articles, debates, joint consultation, academic board and union council minutes. Compared with studies of universities and other colleges of education, relations seemed to be both plentiful and cordial[7]. Yet there was great concern and in all three studies over 95 per cent of students stressed the necessity for close relations.

It has already been noted that the history of the college had determined that the social distance between staff and students was narrow. It was this tradition and the nature of the work of preparing teachers that was decisive rather than the formal system of personal groups. Academic and administrative staff were still playing in college teams, acting, singing and debating with students as members of the union society when this research opened. Furthermore, the older staff saw this as a duty. Students were free to walk into the senior common room and had direct access to top administration.

Three aspects of informal contacts were considered. First, students were asked how many times they had been in informal contact with staff in the term in which the survey was held. Second, they were asked where these contacts took place. Third, they were asked how many staff were involved in these contacts.

(a) Number of contacts

Table 5. Percentage of students having informal contacts with staff in the Spring Term of 1963, 1965 and 1967.

		Year in college and number of contacts														
		First year					Second year					Third year				
		0-5	6-12	13-18	19+	N	0-5	6-12	13-18	19+	N	0-5	6-12	13-18	19+	N
MEN	1963	32	44	20	4	71	8	44	20	28	48	12	12	24	52	37
	1965	22	51	21	2	29	-	-	-	-	-	10	30	40	20	10
	1967	52	45	1	0	35	27	27	27	20	13	19	27	27	27	14
WOMEN	1963	40	40	20	0	91	28	48	20	4	82	12	36	24	28	65
	1965	39	35	20	6	46	-	-	-	-	-	20	50	10	20	10
	1967	37	52	11	0	50	16	61	10	13	42	16	27	27	30	31

The university study in 1962 had shown that 47 per cent reported over 6 contacts and that 27 per cent reported no contacts at all. In this college survey in 1963, 79 per cent reported over 6 contacts and only 1 per cent said that they had no contact. These contacts increased with time spent in the college. Similar results, showing greater contact in colleges of education compared with universities, and a rise in numbers of contacts among second and third year students, were given in the Robbins Report[8]. Furthermore, the Robbins figures, although taken over a week, not a term, also show no fall in the number of contacts in larger colleges compared with small. The growing participation of second and third year students in social activity increased their contact with staff. As they played a more active role they became better known and came into contact with staff who were also involved. Inevitably

therefore any decline in the number of contacts came among the first year group. Just as social participation fell among first years after 1965, so the proportion enjoying over 12 contacts declined. The other years seemed to have maintained their original high level.

The maintenance of contact with staff was one area where women students were no worse off than men. This was a tribute to the arrangements made for first year women, who, by 1967 were all in lodgings, whereas a majority of first year men were still in residence. There were, however, some very active men who dominated social activity and union society, and were consequently known to all staff and were continually in contact with them. Overall, however, Table 5 shows no falling off in staff-student contacts to match the decrease in social participation.

(b) Places of contact

Most of the informal contacts in all years took place without any arrangement. Staff and students met as they walked around the campus or in corridors after lectures. The proportion of contacts over coffee in students' rooms declined over the years, but was compensated by a rise in contacts around lecture rooms. The rather haphazard nature of these contacts did not reduce their value. Indeed, students maintained that such casual chats were more valuable than arranged meetings. This meant that staff recognition of students was very important. It also meant that the physical layout of the campus was a factor in determining the level of contacts. Most took place where the paths of staff and students crossed or where both were sharing the same facility or watching the same game. Physical density and undifferentiated facilities seemed to be ideal conditions. However, they led to more contact only because staff and students recognised one another.

(c) Number of staff involved with each student

In 1963 each student had been in contact with an average of 7.4 staff. By 1965 this had narrowed to 5.5 per student and had fallen to 4.5 in 1967. Again, time in college widened the contacts, third years being in contact with more staff than the other years. The 1965 sample included 20 third years who had filled up the schedule as first years in 1963. They would be expected to be in contact with more staff after two more years in college, but the general decline in contacts would tend to cancel this out. From the surveys average contact rose from 6.3 to 6.4.

The surprising part of this analysis was the narrow range of staff with whom each student interacted. In academic and professional courses a student would be in contact with over 10 staff. In addition he had a personal tutor and hall warden. It was the suspicion that most of the contacts were with a small stage army of staff that widened this investigation to include tutors as well as students. These active, participating staff, who accepted the obligations of

establishing close contacts with students, had mostly joined the college before 1962 and had learned a role that had been defined in the early years. Many still lived on the campus. They were convinced that the college was one of the best in the country, and entered into a variety of social as well as working obligations as part of the job. In this they had the support of the students who asked for more staff participation.

By 1965 many newer staff were establishing a role that was specifically defined so that their responsibilities were confined to the academic. On one wing were those who saw their role as that of guide. They accepted diffuse demands on their time, took an active part in social life and established close relations with students. The other wing defined their responsibilities more narrowly and stressed academic excellence rather than social relationships. By 1968 a majority of staff were taking little part in organised social activity. The pattern for students was repeated among staff. They lived out of college, had research interests apart from their time-tabled commitments and found their entertainments outside the college.

Within the college, departmentalisation had changed the relations between staff. Up to 1961 staff were often appointed to an academic subject and education. By 1968 staff were all specialists. Staff co-ordinating committees had been set up to integrate work, but students complained of the apparently discrete nature of the courses they took. While these complaints had been voiced throughout this study, the arrival of BEd courses seemed to have produced competing demands on the time and energy of students for the first time. Departments seemed to be claiming that their work should be given priority, thus confusing many students who thought of the course in pragmatic and vocational rather than academic terms.

A sample of 8 staff were selected in 1964 and were asked, in each of the Autumn terms of the next six years to fill in a recognition test on third year students. Two of this panel had to be replaced during these years. All of these had been in the college for over two years in 1964. In 1967 another sample of 8 staff were selected who had been in the college over two but less than five years. This enabled the knowledge of staff who had learned their role in the small college to be compared with those who may have learned a new definition. These results are shown in Table 6. Although the staff were matched for sex, the newer sample recognised fewer female students. This was probably due to the tendency for a minority of men to become generally known through their activity, while few women obtained college-wide publicity.

More important, Table 6 illustrates the way staff got to know large numbers of students by name. Though they probably knew more third years than others, it meant that they could recognise a majority of the students up to 1967. Even the new staff who had been in the college less than five years could probably recognise well over a hundred. It was this facility, combined with opportunities for casual meetings that accounted for the richness of informal contacts. It also clearly indicates the staff definition of the role in diffuse, emotionally involved terms rather than as part of a purely professional relation. It was likely however that staff arriving after 1965 were less involved.

Table 6. Staff recognition of third year students

Average number of students recognised by the same 8 staff (as percentage of year group in brackets).

Sex of students	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1967 (new staff)
Men	47 (81%)	37 (73%)	51 (64%)	38 (52%)	33 (43%)	35 (46%)
Women	52 (69%)	46 (53%)	51 (50%)	41 (46%)	47 (35%)	27 (20%)
All	99 (74%)	83 (61%)	102 (57%)	79 (49%)	80 (38%)	62 (29%)

There are however two ways of looking at this high level of knowledge about students and the number of informal contacts. On the credit side it helped in professional training, was appreciated by most students and minimised the dangers of serious psychological disorders developing unnoticed. On the debit side it acted as a powerful social control over student behaviour, particularly in a college in which students were being continuously assessed as prospective teachers. Furthermore, the confidence of staff that they knew the students concealed the existence of a minority of students who did not seem to be known by anyone in the sample. The high average figures were matched by a confidence among staff that they knew the students. In practice they may have all known the same students.

The tendency for students to have informal contacts with between 4 and 7 staff, suggests that students were satisfied with a situation that gave them a nodding acquaintance with many staff and extended contact with a few. Both seemed contributory factors to satisfactory relations.

(d) Attitudes towards staff-student relations

In answer to the question on the need for contacts with staff, students stressed their instrumental value in supplementing lectures and in providing help in the problems of teaching. Secondly, they stressed the expressive function of creating a happy community. In all the surveys they shared the priorities of staff in the smaller college, combining academic, professional and social activity as indivisible.

Table 7 shows how a majority of students still wanted more contacts with staff and that this attitude bore little relation to the actual number of contacts received. Indeed, in 1967 when third year students were receiving

more contacts than in previous years, and many more of the total number of contacts in relation to other year groups, their dissatisfaction increased. Interviews suggested that students answered this question on the frequency of contacts in relation to their perception of the whole college rather than their personal experience. They felt that there had been a decline and were anxious to remedy it, although in their own case the number of contacts had been maintained. This tendency for students to want more contacts regardless of the number that they are actually receiving is probably universal[9].

Table 7. Percentage of students expressing opinions about frequency of informal staff-student contacts.

	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	Too many	Right number	Too few	Don't know	Too many	Right number	Too few	Don't know	Too many	Right number	Too few	Don't know
1963	0	27	71	2	4	40	54	3	1	50	46	3
1965	0	35	61	4	-	-	-	-	0	70	30	0
1967	0	37	59	4	0	21	77	2	0	22	78	0

Although most students wanted more contacts with staff, this occurred within the context of overwhelming satisfaction with social life. Much of this satisfaction was the appreciation of the attitude of the staff. This was clearly illustrated in a postal questionnaire to the 1960 intake after they had been teaching a term after leaving in 1963. 91 out of 125 answered this postal survey, with only one follow-up letter, indicative by itself of a feeling of involvement. This year group had filled up the schedule on staff-student relations in 1963 while in the third year. The percentage critical of staff-student relations fell from 15 to 10 per cent after leaving, 76 per cent saying that relations had been good or very good. Indeed comments accompanying these responses showed how much effort had been put in by many staff in the smaller college to keep in contact with the students and help them when necessary. This was not just nostalgia as other aspects of college life were criticised.

A separate analysis of the students in lodgings in 1965 showed that while they made fewer contacts with staff, their attitudes were the same as those in residence. From 1965 staff were allocated to increase the contact with those living out of college. The other group living out of college in their own homes or as independent, mature students were unanimous in their praise of the staff and the efforts made to keep in close communication with students.

(e) The formal organisation of staff-student relations[10]

A question on this system was included in each of the three surveys of relations. In each, over half the students thought the system unsatisfactory and this dissatisfaction always increased with years spent in college. This was less a dislike of the system than a criticism of the way it worked in practice. This was the opposite of the satisfaction with staff-student relations generally. Here then was an apparent anomaly of good relations, but a heavily criticised system for their maintenance. Furthermore, this applied in both the small and the expanded college.

From 1965 the increased first year students in lodgings created a new difficulty. The 1965 survey showed the women students in the first year living outside college to be more isolated than the rest. Consequently special provision had to be made for them. Furthermore, once the intake approached 300 students the personal group system had to give priority to the problem of newcomers rather than serving all three years equally.

By 1966/67 many second and third year students felt that there was little purpose in having group meetings. The survey taken in the spring of 1967 showed that over 75 per cent of men and over half the women students in these years were dissatisfied. The system was seen as too artificial and more a duty for the staff than a genuine friendship. The survey almost coincided with a movement by the students to reform the whole personal group system as part of a wider reorganisation of student affairs.

The difficulty of establishing any universally satisfactory system lay in the different attitudes of staff and students. Some staff had very close and cordial relations with their groups. Students were generous in their praise for the help they received. But these were mainly well-established staff who had not only accepted diffuse obligations, but were often living on the campus, and who were consequently able to offer hospitality to their groups. New staff not only adopted a narrower definition of their role, but had to hold group meetings in lecture rooms, without refreshments or comfortable chairs.

Similarly students varied in their attitudes. While a majority said they wanted close relations, there were in every year up to 1965 a dozen or so who saw the close relations with staff as restrictive. Thus in the 1961 entry there were 15 out of 137 students who thought that they were subject to excessive control, not only through the close contact with staff, but through the tendency for the small college to leave little scope for privacy. These were matched by a similar number who described the same relations in superlatives.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

(1) Analysis

The high level of social activity, universal participation and plentiful and close staff-student relations at the start of this research in 1961 were the product of a brief experimental period between 1946 and 1949, followed by a long, stable period of consolidation to 1962. The pattern of social life that had resulted involved staff as well as students, and formal as well as informal organisation. No clear line could be drawn between social life and the academic and professional work of the college. Students and staff were assessed by their capacity to perform well in all activities rather than as specialists.

This social structure had resulted from the interaction of a number of related factors in the early history of the college. Small size and a site that was relatively isolated combined to produce a social life that was intimate and satisfying. The maturity of the early students, and later the persistence of National Service had helped establish a regime free of regulations and largely controlled informally within the student body. The presence of staff on the site had involved them in social activity. The absence of academic tensions and the need for close relations to ensure professional guidance reinforced the social organisation that emerged.

It was these traditions that came under strain with expansion and the accompanying changes in academic and professional work. Yet to the end of the research in 1968, the values from the early period survived as references for students, even though the new experience was very different from the old. Superficially at least, students still explained their behaviour by reference to the college spirit and many staff and students maintained that personal qualities were rightly given priority over academic or professional performance in determining relations, even though the investigation indicated that this was no longer the case by 1968.

This persistence of old expectations into a new situation helped in the search for remedies. Students and staff felt that there should be a high level of shared social activity and close staff-student relations. All were prepared to look at suggestions for ways to stop the actual decline. But this same concern worked to conserve customary ways of organising social life. From 1963 there was evidence that the level of organised activity was falling, yet everyone wanted the pattern of events to remain unchanged. Similarly attempts at changing the organisation of staff-student relations were successfully resisted. Significantly, the support for these attempts by students to work out means of organisation that were appropriate to the increased size were supported by staff, but defeated by the majority of students. Only in 1967 was reform accepted. But this was because between 1963 and 1967 there had been such a falling away of student participation that a small minority could dominate union

society. The majority were no longer active enough to defeat the attempt at reform, even though the changes accepted destroyed much that students in interviews, and on the survey of staff-student relations in 1967, had maintained was valuable. By 1968 there were signs that a small, vocal minority was emerging and was prepared to agitate for further reforms, without using the established procedures of consultations.

There was another anomaly detected through cross-checking responses. There are always discrepancies between the roles actually played by participants in an organisation and the expectations that others have of these roles[11]. Here the actual role played by students contrasted increasingly with that expected by staff. This was anticipated given the inevitability of a student sub-culture developing and its insulation from any decisive staff influence, particularly after expansion. But parallel to this discrepancy, the actual role played by many staff increasingly contrasted with the expectations of students. A staff sub-culture had established itself during expansion, resistant not only to student influence, but to the definition of the tutorial role in the smaller college.

Within the small college the student's role was orientated towards the college as a community. There was pressure to be socially active. This was combined with an affective, emotional involvement in communal life, best illustrated by the tendency for students from the early years to return year after year to reunions. At the start of this study in 1961 and 1962 over half the students still returned for old students' reunions in their first year after leaving. By 1968, however it was difficult even to get games teams together from the students who had left the previous year. Every schedule revealed an unchanging, high level of satisfaction among 90 per cent of students, but the emotional links had weakened. Similarly, the pressure to participate in organised social activity was no longer felt by a majority.

The paramount tutorial staff perception of the student's role had not changed however. It was still defined as diffuse in its range of interests, highly participant and involved with college as a community. The ideal student was still an all-rounder, academically able, professionally competent and socially active. Yet by 1968 many students felt no pressure to be active. Further, even though most students still saw their role pragmatically and tended to devalue academic work not directly related to teaching, their actual definition of teaching even in the small college was insulated from that put forward as professionally desirable by staff. From 1965 this was complicated by a minority who were registered to take BEd and who were caught between the pressure to give priority to academic work,the pragmatic definition of the student teacher role, giving priority to relevant professional elements of the course and the attractions of social life, which they, often the liveliest students, found particularly strong.

Similarly, the changing definition of the staff role was not accepted by students. They still demanded tutors who joined in social activity, were on hand to give personal advice and who appreciated the importance of non-academic activity. In the 1967 responses, as in those of 1963 and 1965, more informal contacts exceeded all other demands for extra relations with staff.

Organised group meetings were in least demand. Students still insisted on relations being informal and personal in a situation that necessitated formal, universalistic criteria of assessment and organised staff-student contact.

Thus there was the apparent anomaly of changes in the roles which students and staff felt obliged to play in an expanding college, not accompanied by any change in the perception of the role of staff by students or the role of students by staff. The changes in normative structure within either student or staff sub-culture were not appreciated by those who did not belong. Hence, a gap was widening on both sides as the interpenetration of staff and student social life declined.

Staff-student relations were affected by this schism. There had been no change across the years in the student demand for close and frequent relations, nor any diminution in the emphasis placed on them. But once the student body expanded and became less involved with the staff, it rejected the personal group system that had ensured at least a minimum of contacts for all. Students saw the maintenance of good relations as part of the general duties of tutors, not as a consequence of a specialised activity. The formal system of staff-student relations was too patronising and was seen to give staff an influence in student affairs through the functions of the personal groups in college administration and union council affairs.

Such personal demands were however precisely those that new staff would not accept. They too wanted close relations with students, but through formal, specific duties, not an undefined and unlimited obligation. A level of interaction outside time-tabled contacts which exceeded that of any comparable studies in universities was maintained, but the decline in the participation of staff in organised social activity had reduced the actual frequency of contacts. Once the time-tabling of personal group meetings was stopped and a separate union council structure established which did not use these groups, the system collapsed. Staff were reluctant to try to call meetings of students for whom they were formally responsible because the responsibility and commitment was no longer clearly defined. Simultaneously students became critical of the failure of staff to be present after the day's work when social contacts in an informal setting were wanted.

Here was the fundamental dilemma of increased size. It simultaneously reduced the consensus between staff and students and reduced the contact between them in informal situations. All the physical and organisational changes contributed. Slowly the relations were being re-defined. However, it would be wrong to exaggerate either the speed or extent of these changes. Only in 1963 did new staff appear to adopt a more limited definition of their pastoral responsibilities. Only in 1965 had such staff become a majority. Even then, an active minority of 25 out of 60 who had learned the older definition sustained the level of social interaction at a high, if reduced, level.

This re-definition of social relations was most serious because of the value placed on informal relations. Through all the questionnaires, and the interviews that were used to supplement them, the students stressed that the

relations that were most valued were those that arose spontaneously after lectures, in the corridors, or around the site. Staff who stopped to talk were seen to be expressing a genuine interest, not merely carrying out a duty. In the larger college these informal conversations were less frequent, particularly for first year students. Committees were seen as a poor replacement, and the personal group system was classified as part of this formal organisation rather than as a natural extension of communal life. It was the latter that was valued.

The deterioration in attitudes towards the organised system of social relations probably resulted also from a change in student attitudes generally over the period studied. In 1966/67 particularly, student pressure for autonomy, across the whole country, transmitted through the National Union of Students, was having an impact, particularly as the college had an organisation that did not distinguish between many aspects of staff and student social life. While satisfaction with social life remained high and the students acknowledged the absence of rigid regulations, they had no formal autonomy. The high level of consensus could not be maintained with increased size, and students insisted on their right not only to enjoy a large measure of freedom, but to set up independent machinery to organise this. Simultaneously students may have arrived with less interest in maintaining contacts with staff, although the attempt to measure this by the use of the same attitude inventory on the same students at the start and finish of their course was abandoned once the measure itself was shown to be unreliable when used in this way.

The formal system of staff-student relations could only be assessed therefore as part of a wider context. The whole structure of the smaller college had generated informal friendliness. Staff participation in student activities, their acceptance of social commitments, the exchange of information as staff met students in a college where each tutor knew a majority of students by name, meant that an organised personal group system was almost unnecessary. In the expanded college, once the informal contacts began to decline, the personal group system was exposed. While part of an environment of intimacy, it was criticised only to improve it. Once it had to serve to bolster up personal relations it was abandoned as useless.

(2) Conclusions

(a) Implications for policy

One of the major conclusions of the investigation into the academic and professional work of the college was that these were influenced by the social life which helped determine the working environment and which competed for student and staff energy. The tone of working and social life was a product of the total institutional setting and no single aspect could be satisfactorily studied in isolation. There was a normative structure within which staff and students felt constrained to play roles allocating their energy according to traditions established in the early years.

Consequently policy decisions to encourage activity and participation were useless unless they took account of the norms governing social life as a whole and the roles of those engaged in it. Merely providing facilities was a waste once the motivation to participate had gone. Similarly, staff-student relations were dependent, not on the organisation of personal groups, but on the role that staff particularly felt obliged to play. Reform of the personal group system was fruitless once the norms defining the roles of staff and student had changed. What mattered was the total pattern of interaction, not just a small organised part of it. Indeed students resented any staff who went through the motions of friendship during a personal group meeting, but failed to extend this to contacts which came spontaneously.

The effect of expansion and attempts to solve the consequent problems were also affected by the total institutional context. Firstly, the impact of expansion was delayed because the norms were slower to change than concrete situations. Students who had never been involved in organised social life still felt that they were active. Staff still felt that they could assess the feelings of the students as a body after they had been effectively excluded from backstage student activity. Students still referred to college spirit as a power after the communal life in which it had been generated had passed. The persistence of norms and rituals long after the conditions in which they originally operated had passed, delayed measures of reorganisation. Staff and students saw no need for action as long as they could live off the capital or preceding arrangements.

Secondly, the transition from a small community to a large association necessitated a new committee structure to replace informal communication and administration. Yet staff and students delayed this change because it seemed alien in a college which, despite expansion, remained satisfying and integrated. Only in 1967 was a committee structure established formalising the relations between staff and students in academic and social life.

Thirdly, the egalitarian relations and the responsibility of students for the running of their own affairs had given the college a satisfying social life. But it gave students the power to dismantle any arrangements once a majority could be obtained in favour of change. While the college remained small this worked to the satisfaction of staff and students. In the enlarged college however, this power rested with the active minority. But the reforms they proposed, although passed only by a minority of students, had to be accepted by all. The consequences of the reforms carried through in 1967 were to further reduce the participation of the majority in decision making through the complexity of the new constitution. But there could be no restraints on such action without destroying the principle of student self-determination. In interviews, students criticised the new arrangements, but the complexity of the task of further amendments inhibited them from initiating further action.

Finally, it must be stressed that this college was fortunate, not only in starting with a liberal regime, but in having a Principal who was aware of the tensions of change, had analysed them in print and was ready to tackle them[12]. The existence of this research was indicative of this concern. Consequently

the college not only avoided the sometimes bitter struggles in other colleges to get rid of rigid regulations governing students and staff, but had evolved a system of consultation, in advance of serious unrest and before student agitation for these rights became general in 1968.

(b) Implications for the work of the colleges

This monograph has concentrated on social life, although the whole longitudinal study from which it was derived was concerned with the relation between this and academic work and professional preparation. Inevitably the changes analysed here will alter the working as well as the social climate of the college. The priorities in the smaller college drained away time and energy from work. Furthermore, active participation was encouraged by staff and contributed to a good assessment of the student. In the larger college, with a majority inactive and staff not participating, the priorities could alter.

The simultaneous arrival of the BEd courses provided new motives for a minority. They were benefitting from the reduction in pressure to join in and from the more detached, specialist attitudes of staff. But the majority had no motivation to work harder. At the finish of this survey, as at the beginning, students saw no point in working hard for a qualification that gave no extra reward to those who obtained distinctions or credits. On the evidence of the interview panels, the BEd courses had aggravated this situation by building up a sense of relative deprivation in the majority. In a situation of rapid expansion in higher education, the student who was not working for a degree felt his inferior position, especially as the BEd had received publicity out of proportion to the numbers taking it. This feeling was particularly noticeable among men, partly because of their concern about a long-term career, but also because they were more likely to want to teach in secondary schools where they would compete with others with a degree.

This problem was outside the control of a single college. The professional discontent was contained within the general satisfaction with social life. An index of this was the absence of any significant rise in wastage rates. Furthermore, the interviews with interviewees for places in the college indicated that they appreciated the disadvantages and had already accommodated themselves to much of the frustration. Their experience in the sixth forms had successfully modified any earlier ambitions. Nevertheless, decreasing participation and vulnerable staff-student relations were removing both a source of involvement and identification in the college, as well as the channel for the detection and release of tensions. It is probable that students have adjusted to the consequences of becoming a teacher before reaching college, and the sole focus after arriving reinforces this commitment. This will reduce the level of discontent. On the evidence collected here however colleges will be less likely to be able to establish the consensus among and between students and staff that maintained this commitment in the days of small colleges.

If the internal changes in social life described here have occurred in

other colleges as they have expanded, they will have brought a pattern nearer that of the universities and technical colleges, where less of the student's social life is taken within the campus and there is less contact with staff. But the colleges of education have also been losing some of their insularity. The introduction of courses peripheral to teaching, the closer association of staff and students with other colleges and the universities in the organisation of BEd work, and the more cosmopolitan attitude of specialist staff, have opened the colleges to external influences. The larger colleges have started to give higher priority to academic achievement. They have already lost the tightly integrated character of the traditional training college.

The last decade has been a difficult, if exciting one for the colleges. But the necessity for simultaneously planning for an expanded course, for a new balance of training, for new forms of secondary schooling, for special intakes of mature married women, for emergency measures to increase the efficiency of the use of plant, for the BEd and for a new form of college government have drained energy away from dealing with the effects of expansion. A period of consolidation would now seem necessary. Indeed, if expansion now stops or slows down, the existing system will tend to consolidate, for the flexibility which results from new buildings, new staff and more students will disappear. The colleges have been able to change themselves dramatically over the last decade because they have had to expand.

These changes came as part of general changes in higher education. The colleges will never again be able to develop in isolation from the rest of the system. They will have to offer students academic opportunities and social freedoms that compare favourably with competing institutions. Furthermore, they may have to do this in a period when the teacher shortage may have ended and when there will be consequently more incentive for prospective students to seek out the colleges that seem to offer the best opportunities.

Inevitably attempts to improve the quality of social life in the colleges will have to concentrate on formal organisation. The tendency will be for the informal activities of students to become even more independent of staff. From the investigation at Worcester College, certain proposals can be offered for future planning.

1. New buildings should maximise the density of social interaction, not spread it across a wider area. This would provide a basis for the most valued form of relations within staff and students, and between them.

2. Staff and students should share some common facilities, which each uses regularly, such as snack bars, coffee machines and bars. There should be some opportunity for staff and students to eat together as part of the system of personal tutorship.

3. Staff-student relations are highly valued by students. Yet the quality of the relations that are wanted necessitate a genuine interest in students by staff. Carrying out a formal obligation

to a personal group is insufficient. The success or failure of relations rests therefore with staff rather than students. At Worcester and at other colleges known to the author, staff accepted that the maintenance of close relations was a necessary part of the education of teachers. This attitude was however less frequent among newly appointed staff and was difficult to maintain as specialisation increased among staff to deepen the academic level of the work of the colleges.

4. A committee structure linking staff and students at all levels seems to be necessary once a college exceeds 500. This should act, not only to enable students to organise their own social life, but to link them to the making of decisions in academic and professional work. At the departmental level this can involve staff and students who do not usually play a large part in other committee work. Again, the committees may be unwieldy, but they serve an important social function in the enlarged college, serving as a substitute for the informal talk in the lecture room or corridor.

5. Once the BEd is running smoothly, attention should be switched to the provision of incentives for those taking the certificate course. Some financial reward for a distinction or credit on the certificate would remove an important source of discontent and provide some motivation for the majority.

These recommendations are tentatively made on the basis of research that was concentrated in one college and not, therefore, a sufficient basis for generalisation. Furthermore, one of the findings was that the influence on behaviour was the culture that had emerged over the years. Consequently results were probably specific to this college. Lastly the rate of change itself tended to make recommendations redundant. But the research also showed that the professional commitment of students in colleges of education and the involvement of staff with the students in solving the consequent problems, offers an opportunity for developing a unique and satisfying form of organisation that is probably absent from any other form of higher education.

REFERENCES

1. TAYLOR, W. The social relationship. In World University Service: Staff-Student Relations. 1967, London, WUS. pp. 25-32.

2. SHIPMAN, M.D. Personal and Social Influences on the Work of a Teacher Training College. 1965, PhD thesis, University of London.

3. MARKS, M., SMITH, C.S. and WRIGHT, M. Staff-student Relations in the University of Manchester. 1962, University of Manchester.

4. SHIPMAN, M.D. Environmental influences on response to questionnaires. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 54-57.

5. CLARK, B.R. and TROW, M. College sub-cultures. In BROOM, L. and SELZNICK, P. Sociology. 1963, New York, Harper & Row, pp. 453-456.

6. BECKER, H.S. and CARPER, J. The development of identification with an occupation. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 41(4), pp. 289-298.

7. See, for example: ULIESA : Conditions in Colleges. 1963, University of London Institute of Education. MARKS, M., SMITH, C S. and WRIGHT, M. op. cit. MARRIS, P. The Experience of Higher Education. 1964, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul. World University Service : Staff-Student Relations. 1967, London, WUS.

8. Higher Education (Robbins Report). 1963, London, HMSO, Appendix 2B, Annex U, pp. 504-505.

9. MITCHELL, A.V. Student views on staff-student relations. Australian Journal of Higher Education, 1966, 2(3), pp. 274-284.

10. See articles by TAYLOR, W., KREITZMAN, L. and BROWNE, J.D. In World University Service: Staff-Student Relations, pp. 25-40.

11. See, for example: SANFORD, N. The American College. 1962, New York, Wiley. ORTH, C.D. Social Structure and the Learning Climate. 1962, London, Bailey Bros. & Swinfen.

12. PEIRSON, E.G. The personal needs of students. Education for Teaching, 1965, No. 68, pp. 10-17. See also: PEIRSON, E.G. Training colleges in transition. Journal of the Institute of Education, University of Hull, December 1965, pp. 29-40.

Society for Research into Higher Education

PUBLICATIONS

1. REGISTER OF RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION

(A loose-leaf volume giving details of more than 160 on-going and recently completed research projects. Annual index and regular supplements)

Annual subscription : £2 (including binder)

2. RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION ABSTRACTS

(A quarterly publication providing abstracts of the more important literature in almost 200 journals)

Annual subscription : £3

3. RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION MONOGRAPHS

The following monographs are still available:

No. 2 - "Research into Teaching Methods in Higher Education" by Ruth Beard (56 pp., 9" x 6", October 1967, revised September 1968)
Price: 12/6

No. 3 - "Student Residence - a new approach at the University of Essex" by Marie Clossick (72 pp., 9" x 6", December 1967)
Price: 17/6

No. 4 - "Student Residence - a discussion of the literature" by Stephen Hatch (26 pp., 9" x 6", June 1968)
Price: 7/-

No. 5 - "Creativity - a selective review of research" by James Freeman, H.J. Butcher & T. Christie (113 pp., 9" x 6", November 1968)
Price: 21/-

4. OCCASIONAL PUBLICATIONS

The following occasional publications are still available:

No. 3 - "Research into Library Services in Higher Education" - papers presented at a conference in November 1967 (36 pp., 9" x 6", February 1968)
Price: 8/6

No. 4 - "Research into Higher Education 1967" - papers presented at the Society's Third Annual Conference (52 pp., 9" x 6", March 1968)
Price: 10/6

The prices quoted are those payable by non-members of the Society and are inclusive of surface postage. Corporate members receive two copies of the Register and Abstracts and one copy of all other publications free of charge; individual members receive the Register and Abstracts and can buy other publications at substantially reduced prices.

Printed by Direct Design, Christchurch, Hants.